PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT/EP2003/011135

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference WO 39694	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416				
International application No. PCT/EP2003/011135	International filing date (day/m 08 October 2003 (08.1					
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC H04B 7/185						
Applicant ND SATCOM AG						
 This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36. 						
 This REPORT consists of a total of6 sheets, including this cover sheet. This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising: (sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of6 sheets, as follows: 						
sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).						
sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.						
b. (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) ——————————————————————————————————						
4. This report contains indications relat	ing to the following items:					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishn	nent of opinion with regard to no	velty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
Box No. IV Lack of unity of		in the step and mannar approaching				
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement						
Box No. VI Certain docume						
Box No. VII Certain defects	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application					
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application						
Date of submission of the demand		Date of completion of this report				
06 May 2004 (06.05.2004)		14 January 2005 (14.01.2005)				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP		Authorized officer				
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.				

Translation

International application No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

PCT/EP2003/011135

Box No	o. I	Basis of the report						
1. With othe	ı regard rwise ir	to the language, this report is based on the international application in the landicated under this item.	nguage in which it was filed, unless					
	This report is based on translations from the original language into the following language, which is language of a translation furnished for the purpose of:							
	international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))							
	publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)							
	international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)							
furni	ished to are not	to the elements of the international application, this report is based on the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referrannexed to this report): ternational application as originally filed/furnished	(replacement sheets which have been ed to in this report as "originally filed"					
		scription:						
	pages	1-40	, as originally filed/furnished					
	pages	received by this Authority on	, as originary meditarmoned					
	pages							
	the cla	ims:						
K	pages		, as originally filed/furnished					
	pages	, as amended (tog	gether with any statement) under Article 19					
	pages	1-17 received by this Authority on	19 July 2004 (19.07.2004)					
	pages	received by this Authority on						
	the dr	wings:						
	pages	1/7-7/7	, as originally filed/furnished					
	pages'							
	pages;	received by this Authority on						
	a sequ	ence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Se	equence Listing.					
3.	The ar	nendments have resulted in the cancellation of:						
·····								
	=	he description, pageshe claims, Nos						
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						
	the drawings, sheets/figs							
	the sequence listing (specify):							
	any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):							
4.	made, (Rule 7	port has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this resince they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as 0.2(c)). The description, pages	eport and listed below had not been indicated in the Supplemental Box					
		ny table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):						
* If iten		ies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."						

International application No.
PCT/EP 03/11135

YES

NO

1-17

V.	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
1.	Statement					
	Novelty (N)	Claims		YES		
		Claims	1-17	NO		
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES		
		Claims	1-17	NO		

2. Citations and explanations

Industrial applicability (IA)

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

Claims

Claims

- D1: US-B-6 366 7611 (MONTPETIT MARIE-JOSE)
 2 April 2002 (2002-04-02)
- D2: EP-A-0 680 168 (AT & T CORP) 2 November 1995 (1995-11-02)
- The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 since claims 1, 9 and 17 are unclear.
- 2.1 Claim 1 does not meet the requirements of PCT
 Article 6 since the subject matter for which
 protection is sought is not clearly defined. The
 claim attempts to define the subject matter by the
 result to be attained but in so doing merely
 indicates the problem to be solved, without
 providing the technical features necessary for
 achieving this result.

In claim 1, page 2/6, lines 15 to 17, it is not clear how the contributions which can be transmitted in a time-staggered manner are shifted and how the transmitting stations are coordinated.

2.2 In claim 1, page 2/6, lines 15 and 16, the phrase "contributions which can be transmitted in time-staggered manner are shifted within the frequency-time diagram" is unclear.

It is not clear whether the contributions are shifted in terms of time or frequency.

Moreover, the applicant is invited to indicate the passages in the originally filed application which support the amendment to the claim.

2.3 It is not clear what is meant by the phrase "the area of the traffic contributions is maximized" (claim 1, page 2/6, lines 14 and 15).

It is to be understood that the use of the bandwidth is to be optimized, e.g. the carriers are distributed such that they are adjoining, in order to minimize frequency separation.

The objections in the above points also apply to independent claims 9 and 17.

3. In addition to the above-mentioned lack of clarity, the subject matter of claim 1 also lacks novelty within the meaning of PCT Article 33(2), such that the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) are not met.

Moreover, this IPEA does not agree with the applicant's interpretation of D1 and D2.

D1

Re only the amendments to claim 1:
The transmitting stations in D1 are coordinated. In

fact, the packets can be transmitted by a plurality of transmitting stations, which of necessity are coordinated since conflicts have to be prevented. In D1, the transmittable contributions are at least time-staggered, since packets cannot all be transmitted at once.

D1 discloses two types of traffic: real time (audio and video) and time-staggered (e-mail).

Therefore the subject matter of claim 1 is not novel.

D2

The applicant's letter states that the teaching of D2 does not concern the management of the transmission capacity of the relay station by the latter. However, in claim 1, management is controlled by the control unit CTRL (figure 3, and page 14 of the description). This control unit coordinates transmission, forwarding and reception.

D2 also mentions a central control unit (figure 5, for example) which manages the transmission means.

Therefore the objection concerning novelty in relation to D2 is sustained.

The observations in the above points likewise apply to independent claims 9 and 17.

Therefore the subject matter of claims 9 and 17 is likewise not novel.

4. Contrary to the requirements of PCT Rule 5.1(a)(ii), the description did not cite D1 and D2 or the

International application No. PCT/EP 03/11135

relevant prior art contained therein.

5. Independent claims 1, 9 and 17 have not been drafted in the two-part form, as required pursuant to PCT Rule 6.3(b). However, in the present case the two-part form would appear to be appropriate. Therefore the features known together from the prior art (D1) should appear in the preamble (PCT Rule 6.3(b)(i)), with the other features appearing in the characterizing part (PCT Rule 6.3(b)(ii)).